



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,622	04/15/2004	Sean Allen Johnson	SVL920040562US2	7882

55070 7590 06/14/2007
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP.
IP LAW
555 BAILEY AVENUE, J46/G4
SAN JOSE, CA 95141

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, JOHNESE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/825,622	Applicant(s) JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Johnese Johnson	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 24-27, 29-32 and 34-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 24-27, 29-32, 48 and 50 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-22, 34-38, 46-47, 49, 51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 39-45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to the Amendment filed on 21 March 2007, claims 1-22, 24-27, 29-32, 34-46, and 47-51 are pending in this application. Claims 23, 28, and 33 are cancelled. Claims 47-51 are new.
2. The rejections under 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112 are withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-13, 24-27, 29-32, 48, 50 are allowed.
4. Claims 39-45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 34, 36, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pincus et al. (US PG Pub. No. 2004/0177039).

As to claim 34 Pincus et al. disclose:

a processor (see paragraph [0118]); and

a memory comprising (see paragraph [0019]):

an application program interface (API), executable by the processor, to with a software application (see paragraph [0112]); and

a plurality of subscriptions to a plurality of subscribed-to-items, respectively, wherein the API interfaces the software application to the plurality of subscriptions; the subscribed-to-items comprising a first content of a first content repository, a first content organizing structure of the first content repository, federated content repository searches (see paragraph [0074]), a first work item of a first workflow system, a first work organizing structure of the first workflow system a second content of a second content repository, a second content organizing structure of the second content repository, a second work item of a second workflow system, a second work organizing structure of the second workflow system (see paragraph [0124]);

wherein the subscriptions are requests to track when at least one of an addition, change and delete occurs to any of the subscribed-to-items, respectively (see paragraph [0076]).

As to claim 36 Pincus et al. disclose:

wherein the API is in a format selected from the group consisting of Java, Component Object Model (COM), Simple Object Protocol (SOAP) Web Services, Representational State Transfer (REST) Web Services, and Web Development Components (see Pincus et al. paragraph [0077]).

As to claim 47 Pincus et al. disclose:

wherein the subscribed-to-items further comprise: a first content repository search of the first content repository, a first federated content repository search of a plurality of content repositories, a first workflow system search of the first workflow system, a federated workflow system search of a plurality of workflow systems (see paragraphs [0121] and [0124]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 14, 15, 17-22, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pincus et al. (US PG Pub. No. 2004/0177039) in view of Ouchi (US PG Pub No. 2003/0078975) .

As to claims 14 and 49, Pincus et al. disclose:

a processor (see paragraph [0118]); and

a memory comprising (see paragraph [0019]):

an application program interface (API) that, when executed by the processor, interfaces
with a software application (see paragraphs [0084] and [0112]);

an access services component that, when executed by the processor, relays requests
to access workflow items in the plurality of workflow systems from the API to a
plurality of bridges (see paragraph [0077] - SOAP); any

a plurality of bridges that, when executed by the processor, translate user requests into
requests understandable by the proprietary program interfaces of the plurality of
disparate workflow systems (see paragraph [0077]; wherein the bridge is realized
via SMTP or HTTP); and

However, Pincus et al. do not explicitly disclose:

a universal workflow item attachment function to attach content from any content
repository of a plurality of disparate content repositories to a plurality of different
work items from different workflow systems of the plurality of disparate workflow
systems, and to attach any content organizing structure from said any content
repository of said plurality of disparate content repositories to another plurality of
different work items from different workflow systems of the plurality of disparate
workflow systems.

Ouchi discloses:

a universal workflow item attachment function to attach content from any content

repository of a plurality of disparate content repositories to a plurality of different work items from different workflow systems of the plurality of disparate workflow systems, and to attach any content organizing structure from said any content repository of said plurality of disparate content repositories to another plurality of different work items from different workflow systems of the plurality of disparate workflow systems (see paragraph [0038]).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Pincus et al. by teachings of Ouchi to provide workflow technology for use in processes where the information is in the form of files (see Ouchi, paragraph [0010]).

As to claims 15 and 22, Pincus et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein the API is in a format selected from at least one of: the group consisting of Java, Component Object Model (COM), Simple Object Protocol (SOAP) Web Services, Representational State Transfer (REST) Web Services, and Web Development Components (see Pincus et al., paragraph [0077]).

As to claim 16 Pincus et al., as modified, disclose:

further comprising at least one of a graphical user interface and or--a web-based interface (see Ouchi, paragraph [0038]).

As to claim 17 Pincus et al., as modified, disclose:

a universal in-box that presents to the user the work items from the plurality of workflow systems based on the users' identity, role membership and group membership in each workflow system of the plurality of workflow systems (see paragraph [0032]; wherein the email application has an inbox).

As to claim 18 Pincus et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein the access services component maps workflow meta-data properties across the plurality of workflow systems to a single common meta-data property by mapping at least one of: a name, a data type of the property and a value transformation of the meta-data (see Pincus et al., paragraph [0077], wherein the access component provides a mapping between the namespace and a Java object).

As to claim 19 Pincus et al., as modified, disclose:

an exchange services server that enables import and export of workflow items and meta-data properties in the plurality of workflow systems (see Ouchi, paragraph [0006] - ftp).

As to claim 20, Pincus et al., as modified, disclose:

wherein a single bridge corresponds to a single workflow system (see Ouchi, paragraph [0032]).

As to claim 21, Pincus et al., as modified, disclose:

a bridge factory that is configured to generate a new bridge to support each new workflow system (see Pincus et al., paragraph [0077]).

9. Claims 35, 37, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pincus et al. (US PG Pub. No. 2004/0177039) in view of Zintel et al. (US PG Pub No. 2002/0029256) .

As to claim 35, Pincus et al. do not explicitly disclose:

wherein each subscription of the plurality of subscriptions is stored with information comprising at least one of: meta-data describing said each subscription, encrypted user credentials to be used when detecting a change of the subscribed-to-item, a latest monitored state representation of the subscribed-to-item in an XML format version of the stored state representation, and a membership in a logical subscription group.

However, Zintel et al. disclose:

wherein each subscription of the plurality of subscriptions is stored with information comprising at least one of: meta-data describing said each subscription, encrypted user credentials to be used when detecting a change of the subscribed-to-item, a latest monitored state representation of the subscribed-to-item in an XML format version of the stored state representation, and a membership in a logical subscription group (see paragraphs [0276] and [0301]).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Pincus et al. by teachings of Zintel et al. to provide a device connectivity model that supports ad hoc

peer networking among computing devices with preferably zero user installation or configuration experience and without persistent device configuration (see Zintel et al., paragraph [0008]).

As to claim 37, Pincus et al., as modified by Zintel et al., disclose:

further comprising at least one of a graphical user interface and a web-based interface (see Zintel et al., paragraphs [0003] and [0549], line 9 - GUI).

As to claim 51, Pincus et al. disclose:

interfacing, via an application program interface (API), with a software application (see paragraph [0112]); and

creating, via the API, a plurality of subscriptions to a plurality of subscribed-to-items, respectively, wherein the API interfaces the software application to the plurality of subscriptions; the subscribed-to-items comprising a first content of a first content repository, a first content organizing structure of the first content repository, a first work item of a first workflow system, a first work organizing structure of the first workflow system, a second content of a second content repository, a second content organizing structure of the second content repository, a second work item of a second workflow system, a second work organizing structure of the second workflow system (see paragraph [0124]);

However, Pincus et al. do not explicitly disclose:

wherein the subscriptions are requests to track when at least one of an addition, change and delete occurs to any of the subscribed-to-items, respectively; detecting at least one event based on the plurality of subscriptions; and providing a notification of said at least one event to at least one event handler.

Zintel et al., disclose:

wherein the subscriptions are requests to track when at least one of an addition, change and delete occurs to any of the subscribed-to-items, respectively; detecting at least one event based on the plurality of subscriptions; and providing a notification of said at least one event to at least one event handler (see Zintel et al., paragraph [0076]).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Pincus et al. by teachings of Zintel et al. to provide a device connectivity model that supports ad hoc peer networking among computing devices with preferably zero user installation or configuration experience and without persistent device configuration (see Zintel et al., paragraph [0008]).

10. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pincus et al. (US PG Pub. No. 2004/0177039) in view Mobley et al. (US PG Pat No. 5, 708,963) .

As to claim 38, Pincus et al. do not explicitly disclose:

Art Unit: 2166

wherein logical groups organize like subscriptions with at least one of: a common polling interval for a group and a common event path for a group; wherein said event path comprises a timer, for a group processor, a content monitor, an event filter and an event handler.

However, Mobley et al. disclose:

wherein logical groups organize like subscriptions with at least one of: a common polling interval for a group and a common event path for a group; wherein said event path comprises a timer, for a group processor, a content monitor, an event filter and an event handler (see col. 13, lines 40-43).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Pincus et al. by teachings of Mobley et al. to provide an efficient, reliable return path for returning data from a subscriber location to a service originator in a direct-to-home subscription information delivery service system (see Mobley et al., col. 6, lines 22-25).

11. Claim 46 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pincus et al. (US PG Pub. No. 2004/0177039) in view Zargham (US PG Pub No. 2002/0165903) .

As to claim 46, Pincus et al. do not explicitly disclose:

wherein an event is created when a change is detected with the subscription for the event, meta-data describing the event, an event path the event will follow, and an open schema wherein any content repositories with internally defined event mechanisms will

post events to the federated event system without polling for change and any workflow systems with internally defined event mechanisms will post events to the federated event system without polling for change

However, Zargham discloses:

wherein an event is created when a change is detected with the subscription for the event, meta-data describing the event, an event path the event will follow, and an open schema wherein any content repositories with internally defined event mechanisms will post events to the federated event system without polling for change and any workflow systems with internally defined event mechanisms will post events to the federated event system without polling for change (see paragraphs [0068] and [0095]).

It would have been obvious to have modified the teachings of Pincus et al. by teachings of Zargham to provide a zero latency enterprise (ZLE) enriched publish and subscribe that results in a more efficient message store function and exchange of information among applications (see Zargham, paragraph [0024]).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22, 24-27, 29-32, and 34-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnese Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on 4/5/9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



08 June 2007
JJ



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER